

for their work and support for this program.

COLONEL ROBERT MORGAN

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I would like to reflect for a moment and explain why we should take a moment to honor Colonel Robert Morgan, a man of distinguished valor. Not only was he part of our Greatest Generation, he was a true hero, aptly defined as one who inspires through manners and actions, who leads through personal example and accomplishments requiring bravery, skill, and determination. As commander of the famed Memphis Belle during World War II, and at a time when German anti-aircraft fire brought down 8 in 10 bombers, Colonel Morgan repeatedly risked everything for his country. In this extremely dangerous environment he piloted the first heavy bomber to complete 25 combat missions in the European Theater, an unprecedented achievement and the magic number to be sent home. Colonel Morgan's exceptional courage did not end in the European Theater. He continued his valiant service to his country in the Pacific Theater and again made history when his B-29 named "Dauntless Dotty" was chosen to lead the first B-29 raid on Tokyo. A native of Asheville, North Carolina, Colonel Morgan represented the American Spirit—courage in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds.

BUSH IRAQ POLICY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have seen the television reports and the newspaper articles, and I have spoken with people who recently returned from Iraq. I have seen the escalating violence and the chaos that has engulfed parts of that country.

And like all Americans I have watched the death toll of our young men and women in uniform pass 1000. It is now more than 1050, with many thousands more who have been grievously wounded.

Yet to hear the President and Vice President talk, one would think that everything is going well. The President uses words like "freedom is winning" and "we're making steady progress."

There is no question that all of us here wish that were true, but unfortunately the rosy picture that the President paints on the campaign trail is misleading and wildly off base.

Even worse, the President's statements are contradicted by knowledgeable officials in his Administration, by leading Republicans in the Senate, and by a growing number of national security experts within his own administration.

Here are a few examples: Secretary of State Powell said that the situation in Iraq is "getting worse." General Abizaid, the top U.S. military commander in Iraq, said "[w]e're going to have to fight our way all the way through elections," he said, "and

there'll be a lot of violence between now and then." Senator Hagel said "The fact is, we're in trouble. We're in deep trouble in Iraq." And, according to a recent article in the Washington Post, a lengthening list of career military, intelligence and State Department officials believe that Iraq is a mess and things are getting even worse, raising the specter of civil war.

Faced with mounting evidence that things are going from bad to worse in Iraq, what does the President do?

First, he attacks the messenger of the bad news by calling the National Intelligence Estimate "just guessing." Next, he ignores the problem by repeating the same old platitudes and wildly optimistic rhetoric. Then he and his political allies accuse those who dare to disagree of giving aid and comfort to the terrorists. When all else fails, the President engages in a time-honored tradition here in Washington: He changes the subject and deflects attention.

This President and Vice-President are masters at changing the subject. They have attacked John Kerry's distinguished military record, even though neither of them saw combat and many others in the administration used family connections or deferments to avoid military service altogether. In fact, when asked about serving in Vietnam Vice President CHENEY said that he "had other priorities in the military service."

Imagine what the President's campaign would be saying if JOHN KERRY had said that.

Why do the President and Vice-President constantly change the subject when asked to explain why things are going so badly in Iraq? The answer is simple. They have been consistently wrong about Iraq, and the results speak for themselves.

The President was wrong about weapons of mass destruction, which cut short the U.N. weapons inspections and got us into Iraq in the first place. The Duelfer report found that Iraq got rid of its weapons of mass destruction more than a decade ago, that Saddam Hussein did not have the means to develop a nuclear weapon, and that the U.N. inspections were working. Yet the White House insists that this devastating report by its own expert somehow supports the President's decision to go to war.

The Vice President was wrong about our being greeted as liberators. Think about that statement, and compare it to the daily—actually, hourly—attacks against our troops in Iraq today.

The President was wrong about "mission accomplished." More than 900 Americans have died since that famous photo op on the aircraft carrier.

The President was not only wrong, but it is hard to imagine what he was thinking, when he told the insurgents in Iraq to "bring it on."

The President was wrong about Iraqi oil revenues paying for the reconstruction. It is American taxpayers who are paying most of the costs.

And the President acts as if everything is on track for Iraqi elections in January even as the insurgency grows steadily worse and Secretary Rumsfeld is talking about holding elections in only parts of the country.

Despite being consistently wrong, the President's strategy stays the same—put the best face on it, insist that everything is going according to plan even though there is no plan, and attack the patriotism of anyone who dares to question or to criticize.

They have tried to keep the media from publishing photographs of the plane loads of flag-draped coffins of Americans who have died in Iraq.

They rarely even mention the casualties—American or Iraqi—since that, of course, would mean having to acknowledge the terrible price that is being paid day after day.

They treated the Abu Ghraib prison scandal as an aberration—the work of a few rogue recruits.

They have done their best to hide the policies to subvert the law that were approved at the highest levels of government, and the fact that Abu Ghraib was only one of several locations where foreign prisoners were humiliated, tortured, denied the most basic human rights, and even murdered.

They shut down distribution of a key security report, issued daily by a U.S. contractor—which U.S. personnel in Iraq have relied on for their own safety—because the news of escalating violence in these reports did not square with the spin being put out by the Pentagon and the White House.

Just as the President ignored those who predicted the widening anti-American insurgency, he has sugar-coated the rebuilding of Iraq.

A year ago, he asked the Congress to appropriate \$19 billion immediately, in fact so immediately that he resisted every amendment designed to ensure the aid dollars would be well spent.

The President opposed my amendment to put Secretary Powell in charge of the reconstruction in Iraq, causing the Department of Defense to run the biggest nation-building venture since the Marshall Plan. And they bungled it miserably.

The President opposed an amendment that would have at least required that the aid be paid for out of the President's tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans—not left for our children and grandchildren.

The President opposed an amendment that would have created tough criminal penalties for war profiteering in Iraq.

The President refused to consider any alternative approaches. His attitude was "my way or the highway." And look at what a mess it has gotten us into. It has been nearly a year since the Iraq supplemental was signed into law, and only \$1 billion of the \$19 billion has been spent.

Of those funds, it is estimated that only 27 cents of every dollar has gone to benefit the Iraqi people. The rest has